

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/775,594	02/10/2004	William J. Dally	2390.1007-001	2150	
21005 7590 06/22/2007 HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.			EXAMINER		
530 VIRGINIA ROAD NGUYEN, HANH N		HANH N			
P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, M			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2616		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/22/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

·			4
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/775,594	DALLY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Hanh Nguyen	2616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re lod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB.	CATION. ply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Age 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matte	•	5
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	Irawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 February 2004 is/ Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the com 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ on the drawing(s) be held in abeyand rection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d	d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Burn * See the attached detailed Office action for a least	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)		·	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/10/04</u>. 	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application 	

Application/Control Number: 10/775,594

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1, 5, 8 and 12 of U. S. Patent No. 6,717,942 B1 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: input router storage receives port descriptors from a routing header of a packet; extractor which extracts a next hop port descriptor from routing header; and a header updating circuit inserts an implied exit field in a new header representing a remaining route.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application

Application/Control Number: 10/775,594

Art Unit: 2616

which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Page 3

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Simson et al. (US pat. 6,128,306);

Bass et al. (US Pat. 6,137,797).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571 272 3092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hanh Nguyen

HANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER